

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully considered the content of the Office Action including the "Response to Arguments" section and, as a consequence, has amended independent claims 1 and 13 to delete the subject matter added to said claims in Applicant's last response and instead to incorporate into said claims the subject matter of claim 2 as filed.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 13 as now amended define an invention that is not anticipated by Casey et al (US6493349) nor rendered obvious thereby.

The Examiner has previously contended that the subject matter of claim 2 as filed is known from Casey. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Careful consideration of the content of Casey and, in particular, figure 2, column 3, lines 27 to 56, column 4, lines 8 to 56 and column 5, lines 4 to 28 reveals that Casey does describe use of a network address translator 'NAT' function, but one that comprises traditional NAT functionality where the VPN IP source addresses are mapped to external IP source addresses for outbound traffic, but the destination IP addresses are also external IP addresses.

In contrast to Casey, independent claims 1 and 13 as amended to incorporate the subject matter of original claim 2 define a NAT that performs source and destination network address translation advantageously allowing an entity in the external network, e.g. a network resource such as a call server or a trunk gateway – i.e. the entities as defined in claim 3 – to appear as though it were a resource within the VPN with an address in the VPN (e.g. an enterprise private IP address space). As such, the entity has a VPN IP destination address in contrast to Casey where such an entity must have an external destination IP address, otherwise the network address translation function as taught by Casey will fail.

Claims 1 and 13 as amended therefore define an invention that is not anticipated by Casey nor is there anything in Casey that would lead one skilled in the art plainly and logically to the claimed arrangement. In order to modify the system of Casey to arrive at that now claimed, it would be necessary to go against the teaching of Casey as regards the use of network address translation since Casey clearly and unambiguously teaches that entities in the external network(s) have source and destination addresses within the external network(s).

Applicant would be able to provide an expert testimonial to support the above described differences between the claimed arrangement and the disclosure of Casey, but believes that, since the above can clearly be understood from a careful assessment of the disclosure of Casey, there is nothing to be gained by delaying expedition of this case to await preparation of such a testimonial.

The rejection of the dependent claims is submitted to be moot in view of the above.

Given the claim amendments above, in order to give the Examiner full latitude to consider the amendments after a final rejection, this response is being filed as part of a Request for Continued Examination.

Favorable reconsideration of the claims is requested.

December 19, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26935
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
(312) 759-5646 – Fax